



p: (860) 882-0802 | f: (860) 656-7650
836 Farmington Avenue, Suite 219
West Hartford, CT 06119
www.companionsforliving.com
info@companionsforliving.com

Testimony for Raised Bills 5110 and 5112

Raised Bill 5110

We are in support this bill for the most part but takes issue with a provision in the bill that states that the Commissioner of Consumer Protection may “revoke, suspend or refuse to issue or renew any certificate of registration as a homemaker-companion agency or place an agency on probation or issue a letter of reprimand because of the conduct an employee of the agency while in the course of employment” We disagree that a homemaker-companion agency should be held responsible for an employee if all background checks and training of that employee followed the regulations.

There are two parts of this bill in which we need language clarification (please see our comments are in red after each passage). They are:

“(6) a review of criminal conviction information obtained through a search of current criminal matters of public record in this state based on the applicant's name and date of birth;”

Does this mean that we will no longer be able to use the background check company of our choice? Or, as long as the State of Connecticut is included in their search, any company that performs background checks may be used?

Companions for Living does not believe that using the State Police to conduct background checks meets its criteria for a thorough background check. Our position is to maintain our current background check company so that we may continue to check for criminal history in Connecticut, and **NATIONALLY**.

And,

“(b) Each home health agency shall require that any prospective employee applying for employment with such agency on or after October 1, 2010, submit to a comprehensive background check. In addition, each home health agency shall require that any such prospective employee complete and sign a form disclosing whether such prospective employee was subject to any decision imposing disciplinary action by a licensing agency in any state, the District of Columbia, a United States possession or territory or a foreign jurisdiction. Any such prospective employee who makes a false statement regarding such prior disciplinary action shall be guilty of a class A misdemeanor.”

Is this a form or statement in addition to the standard language on the application that is required by the current act, or will the current language suffice? If it is an additional form, we propose amending the current language required on employment applications to include this requirement.

Raised Bill 5112

We support any effort to eliminate or reduce the co-pay for the individuals who receive services through the State-funded portion of the CHCPE. We can already point to one client named Kay who has had to drop out of the program because she cannot afford the co-pay. Kay **NEEDS** home care. Ultimately, not only does Kay not have the ability to manage on her own, and she will become a much larger financial burden for the state as she will eventually find herself in a Long Term Care facility without the means to pay for it herself.

Living younger, longer.SM